

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the preamble discloses “a machine-readable medium”, which is not met the statutory of useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter

Claims 10-16 are dependent to claim 9 being rejected under 35 USC 101 statutory therefore also being rejected under the same 35 USC 101 statutory.

Claims 1-8, 17-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Ahmavaara et al.* (2005/0272465) in view of *Melpignano* (2005/0176473).

Changes in the Claims:

Claims 9-16 have been amended in this application to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Claims Objections – Missing Claim 24

Claim 24 was missing. Applicant submits that this was a typographical error. As such to avoid renumbering the remaining claims, Claim 24 has been canceled.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – Claims 9-16

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 101 because of the preamble “a machine-readable medium”. Accordingly, Claims 9-16 have been amended to replace “a machine-readable medium” with “a computer-readable medium”.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 101 rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claims 1-8, 17-27

Claims 1-8, 17-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Ahmavaara et al.* (2005/0272465) in view of *Melpignano* (2005/0176473). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Under MPEP §706.02(j), in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness required for a §103 rejection, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the reference or combine reference teachings (MPEP §2143.01), (2) a reasonable expectation of success (MPEP §2143.02), and (3) the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §2143.03). See *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Ahmavaara describes a method for providing access from a WLAN network to a service provided by a GPRS network. “A terminal device or UE 10 which is subscribed to a GPRS service and wishes to get access to the service, first transfers a service selection information indicating at least one APN parameter and an optional username and password via the WLAN 30 to an authentication server 50 of the GPRS network 70 by using an authentication signaling, e.g an authorization request message (1st step).” *Ahmavaara*, paragraph [0025].

Melpignano describes a mobile device that can connect to the internet using WPAN, WLAN, GPRS or 3G.

Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of *Ahmavaara* and *Melpignano* does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of claims 1-8, 17-27. In particular, neither *Ahmavaara* nor *Melpignano* teach or suggest “**using credential information stored in a subscriber identity module (SIM)** associated with a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) adapter to **authenticate access to a wireless local area network (WLAN)**”. In *Ahmavaara*, a mobile device 10 accesses a service of the GPRS network 70 via a WLAN network 30 as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 2 in *Ahmavaara*. An authentication communication is performed with an Authentication server 50 of the GPRS network 70. However, *Ahmavaara* does not teach or suggest any authentication between the mobile device and the WLAN network 30 to access WLAN network 30. *Ahmavaara* and *Melpignano* are also completely silent as to using credential information stored on a SIM for GPRS to access the WLAN network 30. As such, the proposed combination of *Ahmavaara* and *Melpignano* does not suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any “**credential information stored in a subscriber identity module (SIM)**”

associated with a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) adapter to **authenticate access to a wireless local area network (WLAN).**”

Applicant therefore submits that the rejection based the *Ahmavaara* and *Melpignano* reference be withdrawn. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 1-8, 17-27 recite novel subject matter which distinguishes over any possible combination of *Ahmavaara* and *Melpignano*.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the amended claims are now in proper form, and that the amended claims all define patentable subject matter over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Request for allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.


Extension of Time

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 2, 2007



Thierry K. Lo
Reg. No. 49,097

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300